

**REMARKS**

Claim 21 calls for two distinct media playing systems. It is somewhat unclear which of the media servers of the clients are relied upon as the media playing systems in the rejection. However, the office action does note, on page 3, lines 5-6, that the clients are the devices that play back media. Thus, the only possible elements, in the cited reference to Putterman, that could be the distinct media playing systems are the clients.

These clients, however, do not include video resources, nor do they include a tuner. Instead, they use the tuners, as shown in Figure 2, resident within the PVR-media servers and the media is stored on the media servers as well.


Thus, the clients in Putterman neither have video resources or tuners, nor do they have resources that may be accessed and used by other media playing systems. They rely for this function on a different device, the PVR-media server.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 calls for the controller to be on one of the media playing systems. Again, the only possible controller, according to the Examiner, is discussed in paragraph 5. It is not known from paragraph 5 where any controller might be. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 23 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2008



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation